arXiv:1304.4929v1 [q-fin.PR] 17 Apr 2013

MODELING STOCK PRICE RETURNS
AND
PRICING A EUROPEAN OPTION
WITH
LE CAM'S STATISTICAL EXPERIMENTS,
WITHOUT STOCHASTIC CALCULUS

Yannis G. Yatracos

Cyprus U. of Technology

April 18, 2013

Running Head: Option pricing with Le Cam' s experiments

e-mail: yatracos@stat.nus.edu.sg, Yannis.Yatracos@cut.ac.cy

Summary

The embedding of the stock price return modeling problem in Le Cam's statistical experiments framework suggests strategies-probabilities, obtained from the traded stock prices in the time interval $[t_0, T]$, for the agent selling the stock's European call option at t_0 and for the buyer who may exercise it at T. The nature of these probabilities is justified by the slight dependence of stock returns and the weak Efficient Market Hypothesis (Fama, 1965). When the transaction times are dense in $[t_0, T]$ it is shown, with mild conditions, that under each of these probabilities $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ has infinitely divisible distribution and in particular normal distribution for "calm" stock; S_t is the stock's price at time t. The price of the stock's European option is the expected cost of the agent at t_0 obtained using the distribution of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$. For calm stock, the price coincides with the Black-Scholes-Merton (*B-S-M*) price after translation. The strike price determined by the agent does not give arbitrage opportunity to the buyer. Additional results clarify volatility's role in the buyer's behavior and establish a connection between European option pricing and Bayes risk. The results justify the extensive use of the *B-S-M* price and provide traders with a new tool.

Key words and phrases: Bayes risk, calm stock, European option, infinitely divisible distribution, statistical experiment, stock price-density

1 Introduction

The Black-Scholes-Merton (B-S-M) price of a European option has been widely used despite reservations for the assumed model of the stock prices. One of the results in this work confirms the universal validity of the B-S-M price under mild conditions for *calm* stock prices, without model assumptions and without stochastic calculus, using Le Cam's theory of statistical experiments. What a statistical experiment has to do with the modeling of stock price return and option pricing? The modeling of stock price return $\frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ induces a binary statistical experiment, i.e. two strategies-probabilities $P_{t_0,n}$ and $P_{T,n}$, respectively, for the "agent" who sells the European option and for the "buyer", via an embedding in Le Cam's statistical experiments framework through the k_n traded stock prices in $[t_0, T]$; S_t is the price of a share of the stock at time $t = t_0, T,\ t_0 < T$. These probabilities are used to derive the distribution of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ when k_n increases to infinity (with n) in order to price the stock's European option. Conditions are provided for this distribution to be either infinitely divisible or normal (for calm stock prices), obtaining in the latter as special case the B-S-M price. In addition, among other results, volatility's role in the transaction and especially the buyer's behavior is confirmed quantitatively and a new tool is provided to traders for pricing a European option by estimating unknown market parameters. The connection of European option pricing with

Bayes risk is also established when the interest rate $i = 0$ and S_T has log-normal distribution, thus justifying the use of statistical experiments.

In this work, the information in the prices in $[t_0, T)$ is used to derive the law of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ via the price returns $\frac{S_{t_i}}{S_{t_{i-1}}}$, $i = 1, \ldots, k_n - 1$. Thus, it can be considered related with Fama's weak Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH) according to which the present price reflects all the information in the past prices. The random walk model of price returns is part of weak EMH and implies independence of the returns (Fama, 1970, p. 386), thus their likelihood is the product of densities like these determining probabilities $P_{t_0,n}$ and $P_{T,n}$. In Fama (1965), several correlation and runs tests of independence on the first difference of natural logarithms of prices are performed and in the conclusion (p. 90) it is confirmed that: " For all tests and for all differencing intervals the amount of dependence in the data seemed to be either extremely slight or else non existent. ... On the basis of all these tests it was concluded that the independence assumption of the random walk seems to be an adequate description of reality.". The same conclusion is reiterated in Fama (1970, p. 414). Statisticians can model "slight" dependence with weak dependence and this is acceptable in Finance (Duffie, 2010, personal communication). When the price returns are weakly dependent, related asymptotic distributions obtained under strict independence and pricing with expectations remain valid.

Cox, Ross and Rubinstein (1979) obtained for the binomial stock price model the B-S-M price as limiting price when the model's parameters are properly chosen. Jamshidian (1989) obtained the price of European call option on bond portfolios as discounted expected value. These results and the extended use of the *B-S-M* price suggest that the *B-S-M* price may be obtained for a variety of stock price models as limit of the expected value of the agent's cost at t_0 under $\{P_{t_0,n}\}$ when n increases to infinity. The conjecture is proved herein.

Why $P_{t_0,n}$ is used to price the option? In the *B-S-M* assumptions, the stock price process $\{S_t,\ t > 0\}$ (on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$) is described by a linear stochastic differential equation that is solved using Ito's formula. From Girsanov's theorem it follows that there is an equivalent to $\mathcal{P}$ probability measure $\mathcal{P}^*$ under which the interest discounted prices $\tilde{S}_t,\ 0 < t_0 < t \leq T$, form a martingale and $\log \frac{\tilde{S}_T}{\tilde{S}_{t_0}}$ has normal distribution

$$N = N(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}(T - t_0), \sigma^2(T - t_0)),\ t_0 < T, \tag{1}$$

that can be used to price the stock's European option via an expected value calculation. By discounting S_T at t_0 using instead as numeraire the stock's price via $\frac{ES_{t_0}}{ES_T}$, with E denoting expectation with respect to $\mathcal{P}$, $\log \frac{S_T/ES_T}{S_{t_0}/ES_{t_0}}$ follows (1) under $\mathcal{P}$ (see (19)). Using the theory of statistical experiments it is shown herein for calm stock prices, under mild conditions and without model assumptions, that the distribution of $\log \frac{S_T/ES_T}{S_{t_0}/ES_{t_0}}$, obtained under $P_{t_0,n}$ when n increases to infinity, is still normal with the same mean-variance relation as in (1). This justifies its use in option pricing and the frequent use of the *B-S-M* price that has puzzled Musiela and Rutkowski (1997, p. 111. l. -7 to l. -1).

In section 2, the connection of European option pricing with Bayes risk is established along with the embedding and the framework to obtain the distribution of the logarithm of the stock price return. In the modeling section 3 it is shown, with mild conditions, that when the non-random transaction times are dense in $[t_0, T]$ the distributions of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ under $P_{t_0,n}$ and $P_{T,n}$ are infinitely divisible (Theorem 3.2). The prices-densities $\{S_t/ES_t,\ t = t_0^n,\ t_1^n, \ldots, t_{k_n}^n\}$ at the transaction times in $[t_0, T]$ form a martingale under $P_{t_0,n}$ (Theorem 3.3); note that $t_0^n = t_0,\ t_{k_n}^n = T$ for each n. For calm stock, with prices-densities not changing much often, both distributions of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ are normal (Theorem 3.4). The role of volatility in the buyer's behavior is also confirmed in this case since the statistical experiment $\mathcal{E}_n = \{P_{t_0,n},\ P_{T,n}\}$ converges to the Gaussian experiment $\mathcal{G} = \{P = N(0,1),\ Q = N(\sigma_{[t_0,T]}, 1)\}$ (Corollary 3.3); $\sigma_{[t_0,T]}$ is the standard deviation associated with the distribution of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$. Under P, $\log \frac{dQ}{dP}$ follows a normal distribution with mean $-.5\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}$ and variance $\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}$ and has the form of (1). Thus, P is analogous to $\mathcal{P}^*$, the equivalent probability to $\mathcal{P}$ under which (1) holds.

In section 4, prices of the stock's European option are obtained for the agent selling the option and the buyer. These prices are limits of expected values of the agent's cost at t_0 obtained by discounting differently the terms of its cost at T under $P_{t_0,n}$ and $P_{T,n}$, respectively, when n (and so k_n) increase to infinity (Corollaries 4.1, 4.3). Using a mapping to an equivalent structure obtained by a translation conditional on the value of the compound Poisson component of the distribution of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ the term $\log \frac{ES_T}{ES_{t_0}}$ is eliminated. For calm stock this mapping is equivalent to a translation and leads to the *B-S-M* price thus proving its universal validity under mild conditions (Corollaries 4.2, 4.4). For non-calm stock, the obtained price has the same constants as the *B-S-M* price but the probabilities (in *B-S-M*) are now integrands with respect to the probability of the Poissonian component in the distribution of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$. The agent determines the "strike" price X to avoid arbitrage. The price for non-calm stock is reminiscent of the price in Merton (1976, p. 127) that is obtained when the stock's price is the sum of two terms: *(i)* the "normal" vibration, modeled by a standard geometric Brownian motion, and *(ii)* the "abnormal" vibration, modeled by a jump process "Poisson driven".

Traders use the *B-S-M* price for its simplicity and often adjust it for the demand that reflects market's expectations. From the obtained results, traders may instead calculate the price obtained before the mapping to an equivalent structure by estimating the unknown parameters and use, for example for calm stock, the minimum value of this price and the *B-S-M* price.

Additional results are also obtained that clarify and confirm quantitatively the behavior of the buyer. It is shown that:

a) the price the buyer is expected to pay for the option includes indeed a volatility premium (Corollaries 4.1 *(ii)*, 4.2 *(ii)*, 4.3, 4.4), and

b) the probability S_T is greater than the strike price X is larger for the buyer than for the agent (Theorems 4.2, *(i), (ii)*, 4.4, *(i), (ii)*).

The results hold also for random interest rate; see Remarks 4.1, 4.2.

The theory of statistical experiments used can be found in Le Cam (1986, Chapters 10 and 16), Le Cam and Yang (1990, Chapters 1-4, 2000, Chapters 1-5), Shiryaev and Spokoiny (2000, Chapters 1-2), and in Roussas (1972, Chapter 1). A concise introduction in this material can be found in Pollard (2001). Theory of option pricing can be found, among others, in Lamberton and Lapeyre (1996) and Musiela and Rutkowski (1997). The proofs are in the Appendix.

2 Bayes risk, the embedding and the tools

2.1 European option pricing and Bayes risk

In this section, the connection of European option pricing with Bayes risk is established that justifies the use of the theory of statistical experiments in option pricing.

Let S_t be the share price of the stock at time t, defined on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P}),\ 0 < t_0 \leq t \leq T$. The agent sells at t_0 a European call option, i.e. the buyer can buy one share of the stock at time T with price X. The option is exercised by the buyer if $S_T > X$. The cost of the agent (to buy a share) at T is $(S_T - X)I(S_T > X)$; I is the indicator function. Assume fixed interest rate $i,\ r = \ln(1+i)$.

To relate Bayes risk with Financial calculations let P_0 be the probability of the agent who prices the European option. Assume that at t_0 the share's price $s_{t_0} = 1$, that $i = r = 0$ and that for the share price S_T (at maturity T) it holds $\mathcal{L}(\ln \frac{S_T}{s_{t_0}}|P_0) = N(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}, \sigma^2)$.

Since $i = 0$, at t_0 the cost $\tilde{C}$ of the agent to buy a share at T is

$$\tilde{C} = E_{P_0} S_T I(S_T > X) - X P_0(S_T > X). \tag{2}$$

Note that in (2) the expected value

$$E_{P_0} S_T I(S_T > X) = s_{t_0} E_{P_0} e^{\ln(S_T/s_{t_0})} I(S_T > X) = s_{t_0} P_1(S_T > X). \tag{3}$$

The probability P_1 is obtained from a change of probability P_0 due to the term $e^{\ln(S_T/s_{t_0})}$ inside the expectation and the assumption $\mathcal{L}(\ln \frac{S_T}{s_{t_0}}|P_0) = N(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}, \sigma^2)$. Using moment generating function it follows that $\mathcal{L}(\ln \frac{S_T}{s_{t_0}}|P_1) = N(\frac{\sigma^2}{2}, \sigma^2)$.

Replace (3) in (2) to get

$$\tilde{C} = s_{t_0} P_1(S_T > X) - X P_0(S_T > X), \tag{4}$$

or

$$s_{t_0} - \tilde{C} = s_{t_0} P_1(S_T \leq X) + X P_0(S_T > X). \tag{5}$$

The agent would like the difference $s_{t_0} - \tilde{C}$ to be small and to relate it with Bayes risk both sides of (5) are divided by $s_{t_0} + X$ obtaining

$$\frac{s_{t_0} - \tilde{C}}{s_{t_0} + X} = \frac{s_{t_0}}{s_{t_0} + X} P_1(S_T \leq X) + \frac{X}{s_{t_0} + X} P_0(S_T > X). \tag{6}$$

In the right side of (6), the regions $S_T > X$ and $S_T \leq X$ are a partition of the space so they determine a test function for P_0 against P_1. The coefficients of the probabilities add up to one so we have also a prior. The question is now whether the right side R_B of (6) is the Bayes risk for the *0-1* loss with respect to this prior? The answer is "Yes" as the next Lemma shows, and when σ^2 is replaced by $\sigma^2(T - t_0)$, $\tilde{C}$ is the *B-S-M* price of the European option when $r = 0$.

Lemma 2.1 *When* $\mathcal{L}(\ln \frac{S_T}{s_{t_0}}|P_0) = N(-\frac{\sigma^2}{2}, \sigma^2)$ *and* $\mathcal{L}(\ln \frac{S_T}{s_{t_0}}|P_1) = N(\frac{\sigma^2}{2}, \sigma^2)$, *the right side* R_B *of (6) is Bayes risk for the 0-1 loss and prior probabilities*

$\pi_1 = \frac{s_{t_0}}{s_{t_0}+X} = 1 - \pi_0,\ s_{t_0} = 1,\ X > 0.$ *The values of the posterior densities of* P_0 *and* P_1 *are equal at the strike price* X. *The option's price in the left side of (6),*

$$\tilde{C} = (1 - R_B)s_{t_0} - R_B X. \tag{7}$$

When σ^2 *is replaced by* $\sigma^2(T - t_0),\ \tilde{C}$ *is the B-S-M price when* $r = 0$.

2.2 The embedding and the tools

Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ be the underlying probability space of the stock prices $\{0 < S_t,\ 0 \le t \le T\}$, and let ES_t be the expectation with respect to $\mathcal{P}$. Consider the process of prices-densities

$$\{p_t = \frac{S_t}{ES_t},\ t \in [0, T]\}. \tag{8}$$

Define on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ the (forward) probability P_t : for $A \in \mathcal{F}$

$$P_t(A) = \int_A \frac{S_t(\omega)}{ES_t} \mathcal{P}(d\omega); \tag{9}$$

the derivative of P_t with respect to P,

$$\frac{dP_t}{d\mathcal{P}} = \frac{S_t}{ES_t} = p_t,\ t \in [0, T].$$

Since S_t is positive, P_t and $\mathcal{P}$ are mutually absolutely continuous. Thus, P_t and P_s are mutually absolutely continuous for each $t,\ s$ in $\Theta = [0, T]$, and

$$\frac{dP_t}{dP_s} = \frac{p_t}{p_s}\ a.s.\ \mathcal{P}.$$

A binary statistical experiment $\mathcal{E} = \{P,\ Q\}$ with $P,\ Q$ probabilities on $(\tilde{\Omega}, \tilde{\mathcal{F}})$ (Blackwell, 1951). Le Cam (see, for example, 1986) defined $\mathcal{E}$ as Gaussian experiment when P and Q are equivalent and the distribution of $\log \frac{dQ}{dP}$ under either P or Q is normal. He introduced a distance Δ between experiments and proved that Δ-convergence of experiments $\mathcal{E}_n = \{P_n, Q_n\},\ n \geq 1$, to $\mathcal{E}$ is equivalent to weak convergence of likelihood ratios $\frac{dQ_n}{dP_n}$ under P_n (resp. Q_n) to the distribution of $\frac{dQ}{dP}$ under P (resp. Q). In analogy with the frequent weak convergence of sums of random variables to a Gaussian distribution, there is frequent Δ-convergence of experiments to a Gaussian experiment.

Embed the traded stock prices in the experiments framework via $\log \frac{dQ_n}{dP_n}$, $\log \frac{dQ}{dP}$:

- N in (1) plays the role of the law of $\log \frac{dQ}{dP}$ under P;
- $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ is expressed as translation of $\log \frac{dQ_n}{dP_n}$ using the prices at intermediate,

deterministic transaction times $t_1^n < \ldots < t_{k_n-1}^n$,

$$\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}} = \log \frac{\frac{S_T}{ES_T} \cdots \frac{S_{t_1^n}}{ES_{t_1^n}}}{\frac{S_{t_0}}{ES_{t_0}} \cdots \frac{S_{t_{k_n-1}^n}}{ES_{t_{k_n-1}^n}}} + \log \frac{ES_T}{ES_{t_0}}; \tag{10}$$

E denotes expectation with respect to $\mathcal{P}$.

With the embedding, the products of normalized prices-densities $\frac{S_{t_0}}{ES_{t_0}} \cdots \frac{S_{t_{k_n-1}^n}}{ES_{t_{k_n-1}^n}}$ and $\frac{S_T}{ES_T} \cdots \frac{S_{t_1^n}}{ES_{t_1^n}}$ determine, respectively, P_n and Q_n in $(\Omega^{k_n}, \mathcal{F}^{k_n})$. Le Cam's theory is used to obtain the asymptotic distribution of $\log \frac{dQ_n}{dP_n}$ under P_n. The agent who sells the option at t_0 uses P_n, denoted in the sequel by $P_{t_0,n}$ (or by

P_{Agent,k_n}). The buyer who acts one transaction period later than the agent uses Q_n, denoted $P_{T,n}$ (or by P_{Buyer,k_n}). To calculate the option's price for the agent and the buyer the laws of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ under P_{Agent,k_n} and P_{Buyer,k_n} are used when $k_n \to \infty$. Additional arguments justifying the use of prices-densities and of P_{Agent,k_n} and P_{Buyer,k_n} from view points of economists, probabilists and statisticians follow in Remark 2.2

Consider on $(\Omega^{k_n}, \mathcal{F}^{k_n})$ the statistical experiment

$$\mathcal{E}_{k_n} = \{P_{t_0,n} = P_{Agent,k_n} = \Pi_{j=0}^{k_n-1} P_{t_j^n},\ P_{T,n} = P_{Buyer,k_n} = \Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} P_{t_j^n}\}, \tag{11}$$

with $t_0^n = t_0$ and $t_{k_n}^n = T$ for each n. The agent's probability $P_{t_0,n}$ is determined via (10) on $(\Omega^{k_n}, \mathcal{F}^{k_n})$ by

$$P_{t_0,n}(B_0 x \dots x B_{k_n-1}) = P_{t_0}(B_0) P_{t_1^n}(B_1) \dots P_{t_{k_n-1}^n}(B_{k_n-1}), \tag{12}$$

for $B_j \in \mathcal{F},\ j = 0, \dots, k_n - 1$, and its extension to the product σ-field $\mathcal{F}^{k_n}$.

The buyer's probability $P_{T,n}$ is determined similarly by prices-densities at $t_1^n, \dots, t_{k_n}^n$. The probabilities $P_{t_0,n}$ and $P_{T,n}$ are mutually absolutely continuous since $S_t > 0$ when $t > 0$.

Let

$$Y_{n,j} = \sqrt{\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}} - 1, \qquad U_{n,j} = \sqrt{\frac{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}{p_{t_j^n}}} - 1,\ j = 1, \dots, k_n, \tag{13}$$

$$a[t_0, T] = \frac{ES_T}{ES_{t_0}}, \tag{14}$$

$$\Lambda_{k_n} = \log \frac{p_T}{p_{t_0}} = \log \frac{\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} p_{t_j^n}}{\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} p_{t_{j-1}^n}} = 2\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \log(1+Y_{n,j}) = -2\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \log(1+U_{n,j}). \tag{15}$$

Rewrite $\log(S_T/S_{t_0})$ using (15) via (10) and (14):

$$\log(S_T/S_{t_0}) = \Lambda_{k_n} + \log a[t_0, T]. \tag{16}$$

The experiment (11) is not specified since the prices-densities and therefore both P_{Agent,k_n} and P_{Buyer,k_n} are all unknown but, under mild conditions, it is shown using Le Cam's theory and (16) that when k_n increases to infinity $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ has infinitely divisible distributions under P_{Agent,k_n} and P_{Buyer,k_n}.

Proposition 2.1 *Define on* $(\Omega^{k_n}, \mathcal{F}^{k_n})$ *random variables*

$$\tilde{Y}_{n,j}(\omega^{(k_n)}) = Y_{n,j}(\omega_j),\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n,$$

$\omega^{(k_n)} = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{k_n})$. *The variables* $\tilde{Y}_{n,j},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n$, *are independent under* $P_{t_0,n}$ *and* $P_{T,n}$, *i.e.* $Y_{n,j}(\omega_j)$ *is independent of* $Y_{n,k}(\omega_k),\ j \neq k$. *The same holds for* $U_{n,j},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n$, *and* $\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n$.

Remark 2.1 *Proposition 2.1 is used to derive the asymptotic distribution of* Λ_{k_n} *(see 15) under* $P_{t_0,n}$ *and under* $P_{T,n}$ *via* $\{\tilde{Y}_{n,j},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n\}$ *when* $n \to \infty$.

Remark 2.2 *Prices-densities and their probabilities with respect to* $\mathcal{P}$ *have been already used in the Finance literature to express wealth in a new numéraire;*

see, for example, Detemple and Rindisbacher (2008) who attribute the notion of price-density and the obtained "forward probability measure" (like P_t *in (9)) to Geman (1989) and Jamshidian (1989).*

The use of prices-densities and of $P_{t_0,n}$ *and* $P_{T,n}$ *is now motivated from different angles.*

(i) Let S_t *be a geometric Brownian motion,*

$$S_t = s_0 exp\{(\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2})t + \sigma B_t\} \tag{17}$$

with B_t *standard Brownian motion,* $t > 0$ *and* s_0 *the price at* $t = 0$. *For* $t_1 < t_2$,

$$\log \frac{S_{t_2}}{S_{t_1}} = (\mu - \frac{\sigma^2}{2})(t_2 - t_1) + \sigma(B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}), \tag{18}$$

and since $ES_t = s_0 exp\{\mu t\}$

$$\log \frac{S_{t_2}/ES_{t_2}}{S_{t_1}/ES_{t_1}} = -\frac{\sigma^2}{2}(t_2 - t_1) + \sigma(B_{t_2} - B_{t_1}). \tag{19}$$

The ratio $\frac{S_{t_2}/ES_{t_2}}{S_{t_1}/ES_{t_1}}$ *is a martingale with respect to the natural filtration and the parameter* μ *does not appear in (19). This is usually achieved in the literature with a change of* $\mathcal{P}$ *to an equivalent measure* $\mathcal{P}^*$ *instead of normalizing prices with expectations. The option's pricing for the agent with* P_{Agent,k_n} *and for the buyer with* P_{Buyer,k_n} *suggests to investigate whether under these probabilities or their limits,* $\log \frac{S_T/ES_T}{S_{t_0}/ES_{t_0}}$ *follows a normal distribution with the same mean-variance relation as in (19) due to a Central Limit Theorem effect. This is indeed proved for the limit distribution of* $\log \frac{S_T/ES_T}{S_{t_0}/ES_{t_0}}$ *under* P_{Agent,k_n}.

(ii) Assume that stock prices have all the information. Just prior to t_0^n *the (unobserved) information and in particular the volatility in* $(S_{t_0^n}, \ldots, S_{t_{k_n}^n})$ *is better measured by their coefficient of variation that is the variance of the corresponding price-densities* $(p_{t_0^n}, p_{t_1^n}, \ldots, p_{t_{k_n}^n})$*. The agent would like to have the information from* $t_0^n = t_0$ *until* $t_{k_n-1}^n$*, and the buyer the information from* t_1^n *until* $t_{k_n} = T$ *expressed respectively by* $(p_{t_0^n}, \ldots, p_{t_{k_n-1}^n})$ *and* $(p_{t_1^n}, \ldots, p_{t_{k_n}^n})$*. These information vectors are embedded in* $(\Omega^{k_n}, \mathcal{F}^{k_n})$ *obtaining probabilities* $P_{t_0,n}$*,* $P_{T,n}$*. They both miss one component from the whole information* $(p_{t_0^n}, p_{t_1^n}, \ldots, p_{t_{k_n}^n})$ *but this additional information becomes negligible when* k_n *is large, at least in some situations (Mammen, 1986).*

(iii) To compare different stocks (or assets) Modigliani and Miller (1958) used the ratio of all long term debt outstanding to the book value of all common stock, and called it "leverage" (or "financial risk") measure. To compare values of the same stock Sprenkle (1961) used as leverage ratios of successive prices $\frac{S_{t_j^n}}{S_{t_{j-1}^n}}$ *without expectation normalization and obtained the price of a call option for a warrant that is similar to the B-S-M price with arbitrary multiplicative parameters* $k = \frac{ES_T}{s_{t_0}}$ *and* k^* *preceding,respectively,* $\Phi(d_1)$ *and* $\Phi(d_2)$*;* k^* *is a discount factor that depends on the risk of the stock (Black and Scholes, 1973, p. 639). In Sprenkle's ratios, variances are not adjusted for the price level and the obtained price is not the B-S-M price. Using instead* $Y_{n,j}$ *and* $U_{n,j}$ *in*

(13) to measure financial risk, the B-S-M price is obtained for calm stock after translation of the normal distribution of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$.

3 Modeling the distribution of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$

3.1 The Modeling Assumptions

Let S_t be the stock value at time $t,\ t \in [0,T]$, defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$. Assume

($\mathcal{A}1$) $S_t > 0$ and $ES_t < \infty$ for every $t \in [t_0, T]$,

($\mathcal{A}2$) a countable number of transaction times in any open interval of $[t_0, T]$,

($\mathcal{A}3$) for the prices-densities $p_{t_0^n},\ p_{t_1^n}, \ldots, p_{t_{k_n}^n}$ with mesh size $\delta_n = \sup\{t_j^n - t_{j-1}^n; j = 1, \ldots, k_n\},\ k_n = k_n(\delta_n)$,

$$(i) \lim_{\delta_n \to 0} \sup\{E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}}(\sqrt{\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}} - 1)^2,\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n\} = 0,$$

$$(ii) \sup_n \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}}(\sqrt{\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}} - 1)^2 \leq b < \infty.$$

Assumption $\mathcal{A}1$ allows in our framework the passage from stock prices to prices-densities. Assumptions $\mathcal{A}1$ and $\mathcal{A}2$ provide via (9) the strategies P_{Agent,k_n} and P_{Buyer,k_n}. Assumption $\mathcal{A}3(i)$ indicates that the contribution of the ratio $\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}$ does not affect the distribution of $\frac{p_T}{p_{t_0}},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n$. Assumption $\mathcal{A}3(ii)$ implies that the sum of the variances of $Y_{n,j},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n$, (see (13)) is uniformly bounded.

Remark 3.1 *For the expectations in* $\mathcal{A}3$ *it holds*

$$E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}}(\sqrt{\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}}-1)^2=\int(\sqrt{p_{t_j^n}}-\sqrt{p_{t_{j-1}^n}})^2d\mathcal{P}\propto H^2(P_{t_j^n},P_{t_{j-1}^n});$$

$H(P_{t_j^n},P_{t_{j-1}^n})$ *is Hellinger's distance of* $P_{t_j^n},P_{t_{j-1}^n}$ *defined in (58).*

3.2 Infinitely divisible distribution of $\log\frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$

Assumption $\mathcal{A}3$ implies the sequences of distributions of $\sum_{j=1}^{k_n}Y_{n,j}$ and of $\sum_{j=1}^{k_n}U_{n,j}$ are each relatively compact both under $P_{t_0,n}$ and $P_{T,n}$. Thus, we can choose a subsequence $\{k_{n'}\}$, for which both $\sum_{j=1}^{k_{n'}}Y_{n',j}$ and $\sum_{j=1}^{k_{n'}}U_{n',j}$ converge weakly, respectively, under $P_{t_0,n'}$ and $P_{T,n'}$. Without loss of generality we will use $\{n\}$ and $\{k_n\}$ instead of $\{n'\}$ and $\{k_{n'}\}$. The next result from Le Cam's theory of statistical experiments determines the distribution of $\log\frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ from its moment generating function of an infinitely divisible distribution. Recall that any infinite divisible distribution is that of the sum of two independent components, one normal and one Poissonian, and these components are unique up to a shift (Meerschaert and Scheffler, p.41).

Theorem 3.1 *(Le Cam, 1986, Proposition 2, p. 462) Assume that* $\mathcal{A}3$ *holds. Then,* $\Lambda_{k_n}=\log\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}$ *converges under* $P_{t_0,n}$ *in distribution to* Λ_{t_0} *such that for every* $s\in(0,1)$ *it holds*

$$\log Ee^{s\Lambda_{t_0}}=(2\mu-\sigma^2)s+2\sigma^2s^2+\int_{[-1,0)\cup(0,\infty)}[(1+y)^{2s}-1-2sy]L_{t_0}(dy),\quad(20)$$

where $\mu = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}$,

$\sigma^2 = \lim_{\tau\to 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}^2 I(|Y_{n,j}| \le \tau)$,

the Lévy measure

$L_{t_0}(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} L_{k_n}(x) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}^2 I(Y_{n,j} \le x)$

and $L^*_{t_0}$ *is the probability determined by the Poissonian component of* Λ_{t_0}.

From (20) the normal component of Λ_{t_0} has mean $\mu_{[t_0,T]}$ and variance $\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}$, with

$$\mu_{[t_0,T]} = 2\mu - \sigma^2, \qquad \sigma^2_{[t_0,T]} = 4\sigma^2.$$

The mean $\mu_{[t_0,T]}$ is determined by variances since by $\mathcal{A}3$

$$\mu_{[t_0,T]} = -\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{n} Var(Y_{n,j}) - \sigma^2.$$

Corollary 3.1 *When* $\mathcal{A}3$ *holds, the asymptotic distribution of* $-\Lambda_{k_n}$ *under* $P_{T,n}$ *has the same* μ *and* σ^2 *as* Λ_{t_0} *but different Lévy measure. Under* $P_{T,n}$, Λ_{k_n} *converges weakly to* Λ_T, *with shift component* $-\mu_{[t_0,T]} = -(2\mu - \sigma^2)$, $\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]} = 4\sigma^2$ *and Lévy measure* L_T. *The Poissonian component of* Λ_T *has probability* L^*_T.

The distribution of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ follows from the next theorem and (16).

Theorem 3.2 *When* $\mathcal{A}1 - \mathcal{A}3$ *hold, from Theorem 3.1 it follows that*

$$(i) \ \lim_{n\to\infty} P_{t_0,n}[\log \Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} \frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}} \le x] = \int \Phi(\frac{x - y - \mu_{[t_0,T]}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}) L^*_{t_0}(dy), \qquad (21)$$

$$(ii)\ \lim_{n\to\infty} P_{T,n}[\log \Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} \frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}} \leq x] = \int \Phi(\frac{x-y+\mu_{[t_0,T]}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}) L_T^*(dy). \qquad (22)$$

Corollary 3.2 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.2, (21) and (22) both hold when one of the terms in the product* $\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} \frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}$ *is ommited.*

Remark 3.2 *Without* $\mathcal{A}3$ *the distribution of* $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ *is infinitely divisible when the random variables* $\{Y_{n,j},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n\}$ *and* $\{U_{n,j},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n\}$ *are uniformly asymptotically negligible. However, computational difficulties arise because centering is needed at truncated expectations that are also used in the definition of the sequences of Lévy measures* L_{k_n} *in Theorem 3.1. The limit law is more complicated than the one presented herein (Loève (1977)).*

The next result confirms the martingale property of the prices-densities.

Theorem 3.3 *When the ratios of prices-densities* $\{\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n\}$ *are independent of* S_{t_0}*, the price-densities are a martingale under* P_{Agent,k_n}.

The interested reader can use the suggestions at the end of the proof to confirm the martingale property of interest-discounted prices.

3.3 Calm Stock

A calm stock has prices-densities $p_{t+\delta},\ p_t$ (see (8)) that do not differ much *often* with respect to P for small δ-values, thus excluding the case of unusual jumps. To provide a quantitative definition of calm stock, the difference of $p_{t+\delta}$ and p_t over the (forward) regions

$$\{|\frac{\sqrt{p_{t+\delta}}}{\sqrt{p_t}} - 1| > \epsilon\}, \ \epsilon > 0, \tag{23}$$

is measured by

$$\int (\sqrt{p_{t+\delta}} - \sqrt{p_t})^2 I(|\frac{\sqrt{p_{t+\delta}}}{\sqrt{p_t}} - 1| > \epsilon) dP;$$

I is the indicator function.

Definition 3.1 *Let* $t_1^n < \ldots < t_{k_n-1}^n$ *be a partition of* $(t_0 = t_0^n, T = t_{k_n}^n)$, *with mesh size* $\delta_n = \sup\{t_j^n - t_{j-1}^n, \ j = 1, \ldots, k_n\}$ *and* $\epsilon > 0$. *The stock* $\{S_t\}$ *is* ϵ*-calm in* $[t_0, T]$ *if for any partition*

$$\lim_{\delta_n \to 0} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \int (\sqrt{p_{t_j^n}} - \sqrt{p_{t_{j-1}^n}})^2 I(|\sqrt{\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}} - 1| > \epsilon) dP = 0. \tag{24}$$

Definition 3.2 *The stock* $\{S_t\}$ *is calm in* $[t_0, T]$ *if it is* ϵ*-calm for every* $\epsilon > 0$.

For calm stock, the random variables $Y_{n,j}, \ j = 1, \ldots, k_n$ (see (13)) satisfy Lindeberg's condition since (24) can be written

$$\lim_{k_n \to \infty} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}^2 I(|Y_{n,j}| > \epsilon) = 0. \tag{25}$$

When $Y_{n,j}, \ j = 1, \ldots, k_n$, are independent and uniformly asymptotically negligible, Lindeberg's condition is necessary and sufficient condition for $\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} Y_{n,j}$ to have asymptotically a normal distribution and is thus satisfied for the prices-densities of geometric Brownian motion.

Remark 3.3 *From (43) and (44) it follows that (25) and all its implications (including option pricing in section 4) hold also for* $U_{n,j},\ j=1,\ldots,k_n,$ *and that in (24) instead of the indicators of the forward region (23) one can use indicators of backward regions* $I(|\sqrt{\frac{p_{t^n_{j-1}}}{p_{t^n_j}}}-1|>\epsilon),\ j=1,\ldots,k_n,$ *i.e. we can define forward and backward calm stock and the obtained results hold for both.*

3.4 Calm stock-Normal distribution for $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$

Theorem 3.4 *When* $\mathcal{A}1, \mathcal{A}2,$ *and* $\mathcal{A}3(ii)$ *hold for a calm stock in* $[0,T]$*, there is* $\sigma_{[t_0,T]}>0$ *such that*

(i) $\{P_{t_0,n}\}$ *and* $\{P_{T,n}\}$ *are contiguous, i.e.* $\lim_{n\to\infty}P_{t_0,n}(A_n)=0 \iff \lim_{n\to\infty}P_{T,n}(A_n)=0,$

$$(ii)\quad lim_{n\to\infty}P_{t_0,n}[\log \Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t^n_j}}{p_{t^n_{j-1}}}\leq x]=\Phi(\frac{x+\frac{\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{2}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}), \tag{26}$$

$$(iii)\quad lim_{n\to\infty}P_{T,n}[\log \Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t^n_j}}{p_{t^n_{j-1}}}\leq x]=\Phi(\frac{x-\frac{\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{2}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}), \tag{27}$$

$$(iv)\quad \sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}=4\lim_{\tau\to0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{k_n}E_{P_{t^n_{j-1}}}(\sqrt{\frac{p_{t^n_j}}{p_{t^n_{j-1}}}}-1)^2 I(|\sqrt{\frac{p_{t^n_j}}{p_{t^n_{j-1}}}}-1|\leq\tau). \tag{28}$$

$\square$

Corollary 3.3 *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.4, from (26) and (27) it follows that the binary experiment* $\mathcal{E}_{k_n}=\{P_{t_0,n},P_{T,n}\}$ *converges to the Gaussian experiment* $\mathcal{G}=\{P_0=N(0,1),\ P_T=N(\sigma_{[t_0,T]},1)\}$ *when* $k_n\to\infty.$

Thus, for large k_n strategies $P_{t_0,n}, P_{T,n}$ differ as much as the distributions $N(0,1), N(\sigma_{[t_0,T]}, 1)$. From the form of $\mathcal{G}$ it is clear that the volatility, $\sigma_{[t_0,T]}$, is the determining factor in the buyer's decision.

Remark 3.4 *The parameter $\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}$ does not necessarily take the value $\sigma^2(T-t_0)$ obtained, for example, with the B-S-M model. In the Appendix, in Proposition 6.3 it is seen that $\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}$ depends on the spacings of the transaction times and, when the square roots of prices-densities are quadratic mean differentiable, on a close relative of Fisher's information. Conditions are also provided for $\mathcal{A}3$ to hold and for $\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}$ to have the form $\sigma^2(T-t_0),\ \sigma > 0$.*

4 Pricing the stock's European option

4.1 Portfolio pricing with expected value

In Musiela and Rutkowski (1997, p. 110-111) it is shown that when the stock price process on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ satisfies the stochastic differential equation

$$dS_t = \mu S_t dt + \sigma S_t dW_t,\ t > 0, \tag{29}$$

with $\{W_t,\ t > 0\}$ one-dimensional standard Brownian motion and $\{\mathcal{F}_t,\ t > 0\}$ the natural filtration, it holds

$$E(S_T|\mathcal{F}_t) = E(S_T|S_t) = S_t e^{\mu(T-t)}. \tag{30}$$

The coefficient $e^{\mu(T-t)}$ describes the evolution of the price process from t to T and by taking expected values in (30)

$$e^{\mu(T-t)} = \frac{ES_T}{ES_t} = a_{[t,T]}.$$

We already used $a^{-1}_{[t,T]}$ to discount the stock price S_T at t and obtain the distribution of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_t}$. We will use $a_{[t,T]}$ to price the stock's portfolio.

Assume the portfolio consists of b units of the stock and cash. At $T > t$, the value of the portfolio is

$$bS_T + K; \tag{31}$$

K is the amount of cash at T. The agent and the buyer decide to price this portfolio at t using expected values, each with its own probability. They both accept to use the evolution of the price process and discount S_T and K at t, S_T with $a^{-1}[t,T]$ and K with $e^{-r(T-t)}$, and then take the expected value to obtain the portfolio's price at t :

$$E(ba^{-1}[t,T]S_T + Ke^{-r(T-t)}). \tag{32}$$

The price of the European option at t_0 is similarly obtained. The cost of the stock option at T is

$$S_T I(S_T > X) - XI(S_T > X);$$

I denotes the indicator function. Following (32), the price of the option at

$t = t_0$ is

$$E_{\tilde{Q}_n} a^{-1}[t_0, T] S_T I(S_T > X) - X e^{-r(T-t_0)} E_{\tilde{Q}_n} I(S_T > X); \tag{33}$$

the expectation $E_{\tilde{Q}_n}$ is calculated with respect to probability $\tilde{Q}_n = P_{Agent,k_n},\ P_{Buyer,k_n}$. Not having any market assumptions, the question of arbitrage opportunities is studied at the end of this section.

To calculate the expectations for the agent and the buyer in (33) via the distribution previously obtained for $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ rewrite (33) using prices-densities (8) at the deterministic transaction times to obtain

$$E_{\tilde{Q}_n} M_{k_n} S_{t_0} I(M_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_0}} a^{-1}[t_0, T]) - X e^{-r(T-t_0)} E_{\tilde{Q}_n} I(M_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_0}} a^{-1}[t_0, T]); \tag{34}$$

the term

$$M_{k_n} = \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}} a^{-1}[t_0, T] = \frac{\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} p_{t_j^n}}{\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} p_{t_{j-1}^n}} \tag{35}$$

and $\tilde{Q}_n = P_{Agent,k_n},\ P_{Buyer,k_n}$.

Two different cases are considered for pricing the option at t_0 :

($\mathcal{P}1$) At $t < t_0$, the agent prices the option at t_0 given that $S_{t_0} = s_{t_0}$. Then, the expectations in (34) are conditional on $S_{t_0} = s_{t_0}$.

($\mathcal{P}2$) To price the option at t_0 when the value $S_{t_0} = s_{t_0}$ is known, the agent calculates the option's price at $t = t_1^n > t_0$ and in (34) and (35) t_0 is replaced by t_1^n.

In both ($\mathcal{P}1$) and ($\mathcal{P}2$) we let in (34) n and/or the number of transactions k_n increase to infinity to obtain at t_0 the agent's option price and a lower bound on the buyer's price, that agree under ($\mathcal{P}1$) and ($\mathcal{P}2$).

Economists suggest separate discounting of different cash flows; see, e.g., Emhjellen and Alaouze (2002). Bladt and Rydberg (1998) suggest separate discounting of risk free X via r, and of the stochastic price S_T via μ defined by

$$e^{-\mu(T-t_0)} = \frac{s_{t_0}}{ES_T}.$$

They obtain a "fair" price for a European option that differs from (33) since

a) $I(e^{-\mu(T-t_0)}S_T > e^{-r(T-t_0)}X)$ is used instead of $I(S_T > X)$,

b) the law of S_T has to be known to obtain their price.

To see whether arbitrage opportunities exist with the proposed portfolio pricing method (32) assume borrowing cash K^* to buy b shares at rate r,

$$bEa^{-1}_{[t_0,T]}S_T = K^*(> 0). \tag{36}$$

If at T, $bS_T > K^* e^{r(T-t_0)}$ *a.s.*, then

$$bES_T > K^* e^{r(T-t_0)}, \text{ or}$$

$$bEa^{-1}_{[t_0,T]}S_T > K^* e^{r(T-t_0)} a^{-1}_{[t_0,T]} \tag{37}$$

and (36), (37) imply

$$a[t_0, T] > e^{r(T-t_0)},$$

but this is is not guaranteed.

The same holds for the proposed European option pricing. Borrow capital $K^*(>0)$ at t_0 to buy the option,

$$Ea^{-1}_{[t_0,T]}S_T I(S_T > X) - Xe^{-r(T-t_0)}EI(S_T > X) = K^*. \tag{38}$$

Assume that

$$S_T I(S_T > X) - XI(S_T > X) > K^* e^{r(T-t_0)}\ a.s.$$

then

$$ES_T I(S_T > X) > K^* e^{r(T-t_0)} + XEI(S_T > X),\ \text{or}$$

$$Ea^{-1}_{[t_0,T]}S_T I(S_T > X) > K^* a^{-1}_{[t_0,T]} e^{r(T-t_0)} + Xa^{-1}_{[t_0,T]}EI(S_T > X). \tag{39}$$

By replacing in (39) the value $Ea^{-1}_{[t_0,T]}S_T I(S_T > X)$ obtained in (38) we have

$$K^* + Xe^{-r(T-t_0)}EI(S_T > X) > K^* a^{-1}_{[t_0,T]} e^{r(T-t_0)} + Xa^{-1}_{[t_0,T]}EI(S_T > X),\ \text{or}$$

$$[K^* e^{r(T-t_0)} + XEI(S_T > X)](e^{-r(T-t_0)} - a^{-1}_{[t_0,T]}) > 0$$

which implies $a[t_0,T] > e^{r(T-t_0)}$ that is not guaranteed.

Since the loss

$$S_T I(S_T > X) - XI(S_T > X) \geq 0,$$

a positive option price will not allow arbitrage opportunities for the buyer. Thus, for the strike price it holds

$$X < \frac{a^{-1}[t_0,T]ES_T I(S_T > X)}{e^{-r(T-t_0)}EI(S_T > X)}.$$

With the proposed pricing, the agent determines the "game" and plays the market's role and it is natural to accept X-values for which the option's price is positive.

4.2 The Pricing Assumptions

Let S_t be the stock value at time t, $t \in [0, T]$, defined on $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$. In addition to the modeling assumptions $(\mathcal{A}1) - (\mathcal{A}3)$ assume

$(\mathcal{A}4)$ The market consists of the stock S and a riskless bond that appreciates at fixed rate r and there are no dividends or transaction costs. The option is European. The buyer prefers to pay less than more.

For $(\mathcal{P}1)$ pricing assume

$(\mathcal{A}5)$ The ratios of price-densities $\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}, j = 1, \ldots, k_n$ are independent of S_{t_0}.

For $(\mathcal{P}2)$ pricing assume

$(\mathcal{A}5^*)$ At t_0, $\lim_{n \to \infty} S_{t_1^n} = s_{t_0}$ in probability, $\lim_{n \to \infty} ES_{t_1^n} = s_{t_0}$.

In the pricing sections, to obtain the B-S-M price $\log c$ should be replaced by $\ln c$.

4.3 Pricing a European option using ($\mathcal{A}5$)

Pricing under ($\mathcal{P}1$) follows. From the discussion on arbitrage in section 3, the strike price X is such that the option's price takes positive value.

Theorem 4.1 *When $\mathcal{A}1-\mathcal{A}5$ hold, the limits of the terms in (34) with $\tilde{Q}_n = P_{t_0,n},\ P_{T,n}$, and M_{k_n} as in (35), are:*

$$(i)\ \lim_{n\to\infty} P_{t_0,n}[M_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_0}} a^{-1}[t_0,T]|S_{t_0}=s_{t_0}]$$

$$= \int \Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X) + \log a[t_0,T] + \mu_{[t_0,T]} + y}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}) L^*_{t_0}(dy),$$

$$(ii)\ \lim_{n\to\infty} E_{P_{t_0,n}}[S_{t_0} M_{k_n} I(M_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_0}} a^{-1}[t_0,T])|S_{t_0}=s_{t_0}] = s_{t_0} \lim_{n\to\infty} P_{T,n}[M_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_0}} a^{-1}[t_0,T]]$$

$$= s_{t_0} \int \Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X) + \log a[t_0,T] - \mu_{[t_0,T]} + y}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}) L^*_T(dy),$$

$$(iii)\ \liminf E_{P_{T,n}}[S_{t_0} M_{k_n} I(M_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_0}} a^{-1}[t_0,T])|S_{t_0}=s_{t_0}]$$

$$\geq s_{t_0} e^{-\mu_{[t_0,T]} + .5\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}} \int e^y \Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0} a[t_0,T]/X) - \mu_{[t_0,T]} + \sigma^2_{[t_0,T]} + y}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}) L^*_T(dy).$$

Let

$$Q_{t_0,n}(x) = P_{t_0,n}[\log \Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} \frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}} \leq x], \qquad Q_{T,n}(x) = P_{T,n}[\log \Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} \frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}} \leq x], \tag{40}$$

be cumulative distributions on the real line. The option's price is obtained below and in particular, by passing to an equivalent structure, a generalization of the *B-S-M* price similar to the price in Merton (1976).

Corollary 4.1 *Under* $(\mathcal{P}1)$ *pricing, when* $\mathcal{A}1-\mathcal{A}5$ *hold:*

(i) the agent's price for the European option is

$$C(t_0)=s_{t_0}\int\Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X)+\log a[t_0,T]-\mu_{[t_0,T]}+y}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}})L_T^*(dy)$$

$$-Xe^{-r(T-t_0)}\int\Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X)+\log a[t_0,T]+\mu_{[t_0,T]}+y}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}})L_{t_0}^*(dy),$$

(ii) a lower bound on the buyer's price is

$$s_{t_0}e^{-\mu_{[t_0,T]}+.5\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}\int e^y\Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X)+\log a[t_0,T]-\mu_{[t_0,T]}+\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}+y}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}})L_T^*(dy)$$

$$-Xe^{-r(T-t_0)}\int\Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X)+\log a[t_0,T]-\mu_{[t_0,T]}+y}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}})L_T^*(dy).$$

(iii) By passing to an equivalent structure $\log a[t_0,T]$ *is replaced by* $r(T-t_0)$ *in (i) and (ii).*

Theorem 4.2 *For calm stock, under assumptions* $\mathcal{A}1,\mathcal{A}2,\mathcal{A}3(ii),\mathcal{A}4,\mathcal{A}5:$

$$(i)\ \lim_{n\to\infty}P_{t_0,n}[M_{k_n}>\frac{X}{S_{t_0}}a^{-1}[t_0,T]|S_{t_0}=s_{t_0}]=\Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X)+\log a[t_0,T]-\frac{\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{2}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}),$$

(ii)

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}E_{P_{t_0,n}}[S_{t_0}M_{k_n}I(M_{k_n}>\frac{X}{S_{t_0}}a^{-1}[t_0,T])|S_{t_0}=s_{t_0}]=s_{t_0}\lim_{n\to\infty}P_{T,n}[M_{k_n}>\frac{X}{s_{t_0}}a^{-1}[t_0,T]]$$

$$=s_{t_0}\Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X)+\log a[t_0,T]+\frac{\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{2}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}),$$

$$(iii)\ \liminf E_{P_{T,n}}[S_{t_0}M_{k_n}I(M_{k_n}>\frac{X}{S_{t_0}}a^{-1}[t_0,T])|S_{t_0}=s_{t_0}]$$

$$\geq s_{t_0}e^{\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}\Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X)+\log a[t_0,T]+1.5\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}).$$

Corollary 4.2 *For calm stock, under* $(\mathcal{P}1)$ *pricing and* $\mathcal{A}1, \mathcal{A}2, \mathcal{A}3(ii), \mathcal{A}4, \mathcal{A}5:$

(i) the agent's price for the European option is

$$C(t_0) = s_{t_0}\Phi(d_1) - Xe^{-r(T-t_0)}\Phi(d_2)$$

$$= s_{t_0}\lim_{n\to\infty} P_{T,n}(S_T > X) - Xe^{-r(T-t_0)}\lim_{n\to\infty} P_{t_0,n}(S_T > X),$$

with

$$d_1 = \frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X) + \log a[t_0,T] + \frac{\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{2}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}},\ d_2 = d_1 - \sigma_{[t_0,T]},$$

(ii) a lower bound on the buyer's price is

$$s_{t_0}e^{\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}\Phi(\tilde{d}_1) - Xe^{-r(T-t_0)}\Phi(\tilde{d}_2),$$

with

$$\tilde{d}_1 = \frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X) + \log a[t_0,T] + 1.5\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}},\ \tilde{d}_2 = \tilde{d}_1 - \sigma_{[t_0,T]}.$$

(iii) By translating either $Q_{t_0,n},\ Q_{T,n}$ *in (40) or the limit normal distributions by* $r(T-t_0) - \log a_{[t_0,T]}$, *in (i) (resp. (ii))* $\log a[t_0,T]$ *is replaced by* $r(T-t_0)$ *in* d_1 *(resp.* $\tilde{d}_1$*), thus obtaining the B-S-M price (resp. a lower bound on the associated buyer's price).*

Remark 4.1 *For stochastic interest rate* R, *with "expected accumulation" function* $a_R[t_0,T]$ *similar results can be obtained as in Corollaries 4.1 and 4.2: in (i), (ii) with* $a_R^{-1}[t_0,T]$ *replacing* $e^{-r(T-t_0)}$, *and in (iii) by considering the equivalent structure to replace* $\log a[t_0,T]$ *by* $\log a_R[t_0,T]$.

4.4 Pricing a European option using ($\mathcal{A}5^*$)

We replace t_0 in the previous sections by t_1^n and use $P_{t_1^n,n}$ for the agent's strategy and $P_{T,n}$ (abuse of notation) for the buyer's strategy. $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{P})$ is the probability space at t_0, $S_{t_0} = s_{t_0}$ *a.s.* $\mathcal{P}$. The asymptotic distributions previously obtained remain because of the asymptotic negligibility assumption $\mathcal{A}3(i)$ and Corollary 4.2. ES_{t_0} is replaced by s_{t_0}. Instead of (34) and (35) we use

$$\tilde{M}_{k_n} = \frac{S_T}{S_{t_1^n}} a^{-1}[t_1^n, T] = \frac{\Pi_{j=2}^{k_n} p_{t_j^n}}{\Pi_{j=2}^{k_n} p_{t_{j-1}^n}},$$

$$E_{Q_n} \tilde{M}_{k_n} S_{t_1^n} I(\tilde{M}_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_1^n}} a^{-1}[t_1^n, T]) - Xe^{-r(T-t_1^n)} E_Q I(\tilde{M}_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_1^n}} a^{-1}[t_1^n, T]). \tag{41}$$

In this section $a[t_0, T] = ES_T/s_{t_0}$ but $a[t, T] = ES_T/ES_t,\ t > t_0$.

Theorem 4.3 *When $\mathcal{A}1 - \mathcal{A}5^*$ hold, the limits of the terms in (41), with $\tilde{Q}_n = P_{t_1^n,n},\ P_{T,n}$, are:*

$$(i)\ \lim_{n\to\infty} P_{t_1^n,n}[\tilde{M}_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_1^n}} a^{-1}[t_1^n, T]] = \int \Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X) + \log a[t_0, T] + \mu_{[t_0,T]} + y}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}) L_{t_0}^*(dy),$$

$$(ii)\ \lim_{n\to\infty} E_{P_{t_1^n,n}}[S_{t_1^n} \tilde{M}_{k_n} I(\tilde{M}_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_1^n}} a^{-1}[t_1^n, T])] = s_{t_0} \lim_{n\to\infty} P_{T,n}[\tilde{M}_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_1^n}} a^{-1}[t_1^n, T]]$$

$$= s_{t_0} \int \Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X) + \log a[t_0, T] - \mu_{[t_0,T]} + y}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}) L_T^*(dy),$$

$$(iii)\ \liminf E_{P_{T,n}}[S_{t_1^n} \tilde{M}_{k_n} I(\tilde{M}_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_1^n}} a^{-1}[t_1^n, T])]$$

$$\geq s_{t_0} e^{-\mu_{[t_0,T]} + .5\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}} \int e^y \Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0} a[t_0, T]/X) - \mu_{[t_0,T]} + \sigma^2_{[t_0,T]} + y}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}) L_T^*(dy).$$

Let

$$Q_{t_1^n,n}(x) = P_{t_1^n,n}[\log \Pi_{j=2}^{k_n} \frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}} \leq x], \quad Q_{T,n}(x) = P_{T,n}[\log \Pi_{j=2}^{k_n} \frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}} \leq x],$$

be cumulative distributions on the real line. The option's price is obtained below and in particular, by passing to an equivalent structure as in the previous section, a generalization of the *B-S-M* price similar to the price in Merton (1976)

Corollary 4.3 *Under* $(\mathcal{P}2)$ *pricing, when* $\mathcal{A}1 - \mathcal{A}5^*$ *hold the obtained prices in Corollary 4.1 remain valid.*

Theorem 4.4 *For calm stock, under assumptions* $\mathcal{A}1, \mathcal{A}2, \mathcal{A}3(ii), \mathcal{A}4, \mathcal{A}5^*$:

$$(i) \lim_{n\to\infty} P_{t_1^n,n}[\tilde{M}_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_r^n}} a^{-1}[t_1^n, T]] = \Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X) + \log a[t_0,T] - \frac{\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{2}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}),$$

(ii)

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} E_{P_{t_1^n,n}}[S_{t_1^n}\tilde{M}_{k_n} I(\tilde{M}_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_1^n}} a^{-1}[t_1^n,T])] = s_{t_0} \lim_{n\to\infty} P_{T,n}[\tilde{M}_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_1^n}} a^{-1}[t_1^n, T]]$$

$$= s_{t_0}\Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X) + \log a[t_0,T] + \frac{\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{2}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}),$$

$$(iii) \liminf E_{P_{T,n}}[S_{t_1^n}\tilde{M}_{k_n} I(\tilde{M}_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_1^n}} a^{-1}[t_1^n,T])]$$

$$\geq s_{t_0} e^{\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}} \Phi(\frac{\log(s_{t_0}/X) + \log a[t_0,T] + 1.5\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}).$$

Corollary 4.4 *For calm stock, under* $(\mathcal{P}2)$ *pricing and* $\mathcal{A}1, \mathcal{A}2, \mathcal{A}3(ii), \mathcal{A}4, \mathcal{A}5^*$ *the obtained prices in Corollary 4.2 remain valid.*

Remark 4.2 *The results remain valid with stochastic interest rate R as described in Remark 4.1.*

5 Conclusion

When the non-random transaction times are dense in $[t_0, T]$, results from Le Cam's theory of statistical experiments are used on the experiment $\mathcal{E}_n = \{P_{Agent,k_n},\ P_{Buyer,k_n}\}$ to model the distribution of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ when k_n increases to infinity. New light is thrown in the buyer's behavior, showing quantitatively that it is determined by the stock's volatility. The connection of the *B-S-M* option price with Bayes risk is established when the interest rate $i = 0$. The results justify the extensive use of the Black-Scholes-Merton pricing formula for European options that is obtained without the continuous trading assumption and stochastic calculus, using a statistical approach that prices a portfolio with its expected value.

Traders can use both the price obtained for calm stock before translation by estimating the unknown parameters as well as the *B-S-M* price (obtained after translation). They can also use the prices obtained for non-calm stock by estimating unknown parameters.

The similarities of the *B-S-M price* with those of other options obtained under the continuous trading assumption indicate that the tools in this paper, properly modified, can be used to obtain prices for discrete trading via binary or more general statistical experiments. The results can be extended deriving better approximations to the *B-S-M* price for finite k_n values and obtaining option's prices for *random* trading times. Future work directions include also: *a)* estimating unknown parameters in Theorem 3.2 to be used in option pricing and *b)* investigating the use of Bayes risk in option pricing.

6 Appendix

6.1 Proofs

Proof of Lemma 2.1 For the given P_0 and P_1, the right side R_B of (6) becomes when replacing in the probabilities X by a constant c and $s_{t_0} = 1$:

$$R_B(c) = \pi_1 \Phi(\frac{\ln c - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}}{\sigma}) + \pi_0[1 - \Phi(\frac{\ln c + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}}{\sigma})];$$

Φ is the cumulative distribution function of the standard normal, $\Phi' = \phi$. The derivative of $R_B(c)$,

$$R'_B(c) = \frac{1}{c\sigma}[\pi_1 \phi(\frac{\ln c - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}}{\sigma}) - \pi_0 \phi(\frac{\ln c + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}}{\sigma})]$$

$$= \frac{\pi_0}{c\sigma}\phi(\frac{\ln c + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}}{\sigma})(\frac{\pi_1}{\pi_0}\frac{\phi(\frac{\ln c - \frac{\sigma^2}{2}}{\sigma})}{\phi(\frac{\ln c + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}}{\sigma})} - 1) = \frac{\pi_0}{c\sigma}\phi(\frac{\ln c + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}}{\sigma})(\frac{\pi_1}{\pi_0}c - 1).$$

It follows that $R'_B(c) = 0$ when $c = \frac{\pi_0}{\pi_1} = X$ and $R''_B(X) = \frac{\pi_1}{X\sigma}\phi(\frac{\ln X + \frac{\sigma^2}{2}}{\sigma}) > 0$. Therefore, $R_B = R_B(X)$ is the Bayes risk for the *0-1* loss for the given prior.

The price $\tilde{C}$ in (7) follows from (6) and the *B-S-M* price follows from (4).

$\square$

Proof of Proposition 2.1- Independence of $\tilde{Y}_{n,j}, \tilde{U}_{n,j}, \frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n$ **under** $P_{t_0,n}, P_{T,n}$

Define on $(\Omega^{k_n}, \mathcal{F}^{k_n})$ random variables

$$\tilde{Y}_{n,j}(\omega^{(k_n)}) = Y_{n,j}(\omega_j),\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n,$$

$\omega^{(k_n)} = (\omega_1, \ldots, \omega_{k_n})$. Then, $\tilde{Y}_{n,j},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n$, are independent with respect to $P_{t_0,n}$ (defined in (12)), i.e.

$$P_{t_0,n}[\cap_{j=1}^{k_n}\{\tilde{Y}_{n,j} \in B_j\}] = \Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} P_{t_0,n}[\tilde{Y}_{n,j} \in B_j]. \tag{42}$$

Equality (42) follows from (12) and equality

$$\cap_{j=1}^{k_n}\{\omega^{(k_n)} : \tilde{Y}_{n,j}(\omega^{(k_n)}) \in B_j\} = \{\omega_1 : Y_{n,1}(\omega_1) \in B_1\}x \ldots x\{\omega_{k_n} : Y_{n,k_n}(\omega_{k_n}) \in B_{k_n}\}$$

which holds since

$$\{\omega^{(k_n)} : \tilde{Y}_{n,j}(\omega^{(k_n)}) \in B_j\} = \Omega x \ldots x\{\omega_j : Y_{n,j}(\omega_j) \in B_j\}x \ldots x\Omega,\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n.$$

One can confirm in the same way independence of $\tilde{Y}_{n,j}, j = 1, \ldots, k_n$, with respect to $P_{T,n}$. The same results hold for $\tilde{U}_{n,j},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n$ defined similarly on $(\Omega^{k_n}, \mathcal{F}^{k_n})$ from $U_{n,j},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n$. Since

$$(Y_{n,j} + 1)^2 = \frac{p_{t,j}^n}{p_{t,j-1}^n},\ j = 1, \ldots, k_n,$$

independence, in the same sense, of the price-densities ratios follows. $\square$

Proposition 6.1 *(i) For $Y_{n,j},\ U_{n,j},\ j=1,\ldots,k_n$, in (13) and for ϵ small,*

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}^2 I(|Y_{n,j}| > \frac{\epsilon}{1-2\epsilon}) \le \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_j^n}} U_{n,j}^2 I(|U_{n,j}| > \frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}) \le \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}^2 I(|Y_{n,j}| > \epsilon). \tag{43}$$

(ii) If $\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}^2 < +\infty$, then

$$\lim_{\tau\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}^2 I(|Y_{n,j}| \le \tau) = \lim_{\tau\to 0}\lim_{n\to\infty}\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_j^n}} U_{n,j}^2 I(|U_{n,j}| \le \tau). \tag{44}$$

Remark 6.1 *Proposition 6.1 shows that if $\{Y_{n,j},\ j=1,\ldots,k_n\}$ satisfy Lindeberg's condition the same holds for $\{U_{n,j},\ j=1,\ldots,k_n\}$, and conversely.*

Proof of Proposition 6.1

(i) Note that for densities f and g it holds

$$I(|\sqrt{\frac{f}{g}}-1| > \epsilon) = 1 \Longleftrightarrow \{\sqrt{\frac{f}{g}}-1 > \epsilon\} \text{ or } \{\sqrt{\frac{f}{g}}-1 < -\epsilon\}.$$

Observe that

$$\sqrt{\frac{f}{g}} > 1+\epsilon \Longleftrightarrow \sqrt{\frac{g}{f}} < \frac{1}{1+\epsilon} = 1-\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon},$$

$$\sqrt{\frac{f}{g}} < 1-\epsilon \Longleftrightarrow \sqrt{\frac{g}{f}} > \frac{1}{1-\epsilon} = 1+\frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon},$$

and that for small ϵ,

$$0 < 1-\frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon} \le 1-\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}.$$

Thus, it holds

$$\{|\sqrt{\frac{f}{g}}-1|>\epsilon\}=\{\sqrt{\frac{g}{f}}<1-\frac{\epsilon}{1+\epsilon}\}\cup\{\sqrt{\frac{g}{f}}>1+\frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\}\supseteq\{|\sqrt{\frac{g}{f}}-1|>\frac{\epsilon}{1-\epsilon}\}.$$

(ii) It follows from (i) since $\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t^n_{j-1}}} Y^2_{n,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t^n_j}} U^2_{n,j}$. □

Proof of Corollary 3.1 Follows from (44), the equalities $E_{P_{t^n_{j-1}}} Y_{n,j} = E_{P_{t^n_j}} U_{n,j},\ j=1,\ldots,k_n$, and the definition of L_{t_0} (in Theorem 3.1). □

Proof of Theorem 3.2-Infinitely divisible distribution of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$

From Theorem 3.1, the distribution of Λ_{t_0} (resp. Λ_T) is that of a sum of a normal random variable X and a Poissonian random variable Y that are independent. Parts (i) and (ii) follow by conditioning the limit distribution on the value $Y=y$ of the Poissonian component, and then integrating with $L^*_{t_0}$ and L^*_T respectively.

□

Proof of Theorem 3.3-The martingale property of prices-densities

It is enough to show that

$$E_{P_{t_0,n}}[p_{t^n_{j+k}}|p_{t^n_j}, p_{t^n_{j-1}}, \ldots, p_{t^n_1}, p_{t_0}] = p_{t^n_j}.$$

Observe that

$$E_{P_{t^n_{j-1}}} \frac{p_{t^n_j}}{p_{t^n_{j-1}}} = \int \frac{p_{t^n_j}}{p_{t^n_{j-1}}} p_{t^n_{j-1}} dP = \int \frac{S_{t^n_j}}{ES_{t^n_j}} dP = 1,\ j=1,\ldots,k_n. \tag{45}$$

From the independence of prices-densities ratios and (45)

$$E_{P_{t_0,n}}[\frac{p_{t^n_{j+k}}}{p_{t^n_j}}|p_{t^n_j}, p_{t^n_{j-1}}, \ldots, p_{t^n_1}, p_{t_0}] = E_{P_{t_0,n}}[\Pi_{m=1}^k \frac{p_{t^n_{j+m}}}{p^n_{t_{j+m-1}}}|\frac{p_{t^n_j}}{p_{p^n_{j-1}}}, \ldots, \frac{p_{t^n_1}}{p_{t_0}}, p_{t_0}]$$

$$= \Pi_{m=1}^{k} E_{P_{t_{j+m-1}^n}} \frac{p_{t_{j+m}^n}}{p_{t_{j+m-1}^n}} = 1, \ j = 1, \ldots, k_n.$$

Using (45), the interested reader can check the martingale property of the interest-discounted prices, for the martingale measure obtained with a scale change of random variables with probability $P_{t_{j-1}^n}, \ j = 1, \ldots, k_n$. $\square$

To prove Theorem 3.4, the asymptotic distribution of Λ_{k_n} (see (15)) is approximated by the asymptotic distribution of $W_{k_n} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} Y_{n,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \tilde{Y}_{n,j}$ via next lemma that appears in Le Cam and Yang (2000); see section 5.2.7, p.92-94, Proposition 8, section 5.3 p. 95, conditions (B) and (N) and p. 108, lines -10 to -7. The proof of the Lemma is provided for convenience of the reader.

Lemma 6.1 *Assume that under* $P_{t_0,n}$[1]

$$\sup\{|Y_{n,j}|, j = 1, \ldots, k_n\}_{n\to\infty} \longrightarrow 0 \qquad \textit{in probability.} \tag{46}$$

When $\mathcal{A}3$ *holds, under* $P_{t_0,n}$

$$\Lambda_{k_n} - 2W_{k_n} + \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} Y_{n,j}^2 \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \qquad \textit{in probability.}$$

Proof. Make a Taylor expansion of the function $\log(1+x)$ around 0 to obtain

$$\log(1+x) - x + .5x^2 = x^2 R(x)$$

---

[1] Abuse of notation since $Y_{n,j} = \tilde{Y}_{n,j}, \ j = 1, \ldots, k_n$.

with $\lim_{x\to 0} R(x) = 0$. Then,

$$|2\sum_{j=1}^{k_n}\log(1+Y_{n,j}) - 2\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} Y_{n,j} + \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} Y_{n,j}^2| = |\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} Y_{n,j}^2 R(Y_{n,j})|$$

$$\leq \sup_{1\leq j\leq k_n} |R(Y_{n,j})| \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} Y_{n,j}^2 \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$$

in probability since $\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} Y_{n,j}^2$ is bounded in probability and $\sup_{1\leq j\leq k_n} |R(Y_{n,j})|$ converges to 0 in probability. $\square$

Lemma 6.2 *(see, for example, Le Cam and Yang, 2000, Proposition 1, p. 40 and p. 41, lines 14-19) For the binary experiments* $\mathcal{E}_n = \{P_{0,n},\ P_{1,n}\}$*, assume that* $\{P_{1,n}\}$ *is contiguous to* $\{P_{0,n}\}$ *and that the asymptotic distribution of* $\log M_n$ *under* $P_{0,n}$ *is normal with mean* μ *and variance* σ^2*;* $M_n = \frac{dP_{1,n}}{dP_{0,n}}$ *is the density of the part of* $P_{1,n}$ *dominated by* $P_{0,n}$*. Then*

(i) $\mu = -.5\sigma^2$*, and*

(ii) the asymptotic distribution of $\log M_n$ *under* $P_{1,n}$ *is normal with mean* $.5\sigma^2$ *and variance* σ^2*.*

Lemma 6.3 *Under* $\mathcal{A}3$*, let* F_n *be the distribution of* $W_{k_n} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} Y_{n,j}$*. Assume that* F_n *converges weakly to a probability distribution* F *with Lévy representation* $(\mu,\ \sigma^2,\ L)$*;* μ *is the "shift",* σ^2 *is the variance of the normal component and* L *is the Lévy measure. Then,*

a) the sequence $\{P_{T,n}\}$ *is contiguous to the sequence* $\{P_{t_0,n}\}$ *if and only if the* *variance of F is the limit of the variances of F_n.*

b) the sequence $\{P_{t_0,n}\}$ is contiguous to the sequence $\{P_{T,n}\}$ if and only if $L(-1)=0$.

Proof. It follows from the Corollary in Le Cam and Yang (1990, p. 47) and the Remark, p.48, lines 3-12, since $P_{t^n_{j-1}},\ P_{t^n_j},\ j=1,\ldots,k_n$, do not have singular parts. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3.4-Normal distribution for $\log\frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$

Under $P_{t_0,n}$ (defined in (12)),

$$E_{P_{t_0,n}}\tilde{Y}_{n,j} = E_{P_{t^n_{j-1}}}Y_{n,j} = \int(\sqrt{p_{t^n_j}}\sqrt{p_{t^n_{j-1}}}-1)dP = -h^2(P_{t^n_j},P_{t^n_{j-1}}) = -h^2_{n,j}. \tag{47}$$

The equivalence of $P,\ P_{t^n_j},\ j=0,\ldots,k_n$, implies that

$$E_{P_{t_0,n}}\tilde{Y}^2_{n,j} = E_{P_{t^n_{j-1}}}Y^2_{n,j} = \int(\frac{p_{t^n_j}}{p_{t^n_{j-1}}}-2\sqrt{\frac{p_{t^n_j}}{p_{t^n_{j-1}}}}+1)dP_{t^n_{j-1}} = 2h^2_{n,j}, \tag{48}$$

$$Var_{P_{t_0,n}}(\tilde{Y}_{n,j}) = Var_{P_{t^n_{j-1}}}(Y_{n,j}) = 2h^2_{n,j}(1-h^2_{n,j}),\ j=1,\ldots,k_n. \tag{49}$$

For calm stock, from (25) it follows that

$$P_{t_0,n}[\cup_{j=1}^{k_n}\{|\tilde{Y}_{n,j}|>\epsilon\}] \le \sum_{j=1}^{k_n}P_{t^n_{j-1}}[|Y_{n,j}|>\epsilon]$$

$$\le \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\sum_{j=1}^{k_n}E_{P_{t^n_{j-1}}}Y^2_{n,j}I(|Y_{n,j}|>\epsilon)\underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow}0,\ \text{and}$$

$$\sup\{|\tilde{Y}_{n,j}|, j=1,\ldots,k_n\}_{n\to\infty}\to 0 \tag{50}$$

in $P_{t_0,n}$-probability. Thus, Lemma 6.1 can be used to approximate the asymptotic distribution of Λ_{k_n} (see (15)) with that of $W_{k_n} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} Y_{n,j} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} \tilde{Y}_{n,j}$. Assumption $\mathcal{A}3(i)$ also holds for calm stocks since from (48)

$$2h_{n,j}^2 = E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}^2 \leq \epsilon^2 + E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}^2 I(|Y_{n,j}| > \epsilon) \leq \epsilon^2 + \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}^2 I(|Y_{n,j}| > \epsilon).$$

It follows from $\mathcal{A}3$ that

$$\sup_{1 \leq j \leq k_n} E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}}(Y_{n,j}^2) = \sup_{1 \leq j \leq k_n} h_{n,j}^2 \ {}_{n\to\infty} \to 0,$$

and

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} [E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}]^2 = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} h_{n,j}^4 \leq \sup_{1 \leq j \leq k_n} h_{n,j}^2 \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} h_{n,j}^2 \ {}_{n\to\infty} \to 0. \tag{51}$$

Since from (51) and $\mathcal{A}3(i)$ the truncated expectation of $Y_{n,j}$ converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$, $j = 1, \ldots, k_n$, (see, for example, Le Cam and Yang, 1990, Lemma 1, p. 34), and from $A3(ii)$ the sum of the variances is bounded, for a calm stock the $Y_{n,j}$'s satisfy Lindeberg's condition and $W_{k_n} = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} Y_{n,j}$ has distribution F_n that converges weakly to a normal distribution F with mean μ and variance σ^2 (see Le Cam and Yang, 1990, p.44)

$$\mu = -\lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} h_{n,j}^2, \qquad \sigma^2 = \lim_{\tau\to 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}^2 I(|Y_{n,j}| \leq \tau). \tag{52}$$

From Lemma 6.1, since

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} Y_{n,j}^2 - \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} E_{P_{t_{j-1}^n}} Y_{n,j}^2 \underset{n\to\infty}{\longrightarrow} 0$$

in probability, it follows that the asymptotic distribution of Λ_n is normal $N(\mu_{[t_0,T]}, \sigma^2_{[t_0,T]})$, with

$$\mu_{[t_0,T]} = 2\mu - \sigma^2, \qquad \sigma^2_{[t_0,T]} = 4\sigma^2. \tag{53}$$

Asymptotic normality of W_{k_n} for calm stocks implies that the limit of the variance of F_n is equal to the variance of F (see Le Cam and Yang, 1990, p. 49, lines -20 to -6). It follows from Lemma 6.3 *a)* that $\{P_{T,n}\}$ is contiguous to $\{P_{t_0,n}\}$, and from Lemma 6.2 (i) for the mean $\mu_{[t_0,T]}$ and the variance $\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}$ of the asymptotic distribution of Λ_{k_n} it holds $\mu_{[t_0,T]} = -\frac{\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{2}$. Thus, from Lemma 6.3 *b)*, $\{P_{t_0,n}\}$ and $\{P_{T,n}\}$ are contiguous. Since

$$P_{T,n}[\log \frac{\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} p_{t_j^n}}{\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} p_{t_{j-1}^n}} \leq x] = P_{T,n}[-\log \frac{\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} p_{t_{j-1}^n}}{\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n} p_{t_j^n}} \leq x],$$

(27) follows from (ii) and Proposition 6.1, or simply from Lemma 6.2 (ii).

Lemma 6.4 *If a random variable W has under P normal distribution with mean M and variance Σ^2 and*

$$\frac{dP^*}{dP} = e^{AW+C}, \quad -C = MA + \frac{\Sigma^2 A^2}{2}, \tag{54}$$

the distribution of W under P^* is normal with mean M^* and variance Σ^{*2},

$$M^* = M + A\Sigma^2, \quad \Sigma^{*2} = \Sigma^2. \tag{55}$$

Proof Follows from the moment generating function $E_{P^*} e^{\rho W}$.

Proof of Theorem 4.1 Part *(i)* follows by taking logarithms in both sides of the inequality inside the probability, and using Theorem 3.2 (i) and $\mathcal{A}5$. For *(ii)* and *(iii)*, calculation of expectations is replaced by calculations of probabilities, after change of the underlying probabilities in the expectations.

(ii) From $\mathcal{A}5$, mutual absolute continuity of $P_{t_0,n}$ and $P_{T,n}$ and changing probabilities we obtain

$$E_{P_{t_0,n}}[S_{t_0}M_{k_n}I(M_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_0}}a^{-1}[t_0,T])|S_{t_0} = s_{t_0}]$$
$$= s_{t_0}E_{P_{t_0,n}}[\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}I(\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}} > \frac{Xa^{-1}[t_0,T]}{s_{t_0}})|S_{t_0} = s_{t_0}]$$
$$= s_{t_0}E_{P_{t_0,n}}\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}I(\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}} > \frac{Xa^{-1}[t_0,T]}{s_{t_0}})$$
$$= s_{t_0}P_{T,n}[\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}} > \frac{Xa^{-1}[t_0,T]}{s_{t_0}}].$$

The result follows from Theorem 3.2 (ii) by conditioning the limit distribution on the value $Y = y$ of the Poissonian component.

(iii) From $\mathcal{A}5$,

$$E_{P_{T,n}}[S_{t_0}M_{k_n}I(M_{k_n} > \frac{X}{S_{t_0}}a^{-1}[t_0,T])|S_{t_0} = s_{t_0}]$$
$$= s_{t_0}E_{P_{T,n}}[\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}I(\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}} > \frac{Xa^{-1}[t_0,T]}{s_{t_0}})|S_{t_0} = s_{t_0}]$$
$$= s_{t_0}E_{P_{T,n}}\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}I(\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}} > \frac{Xa^{-1}[t_0,T]}{s_{t_0}})$$

Using Skorohod's theorem, Fatou's Lemma and Theorem 3.2 (ii),

$$\liminf E_{P_{T,n}}\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}}I(\Pi_{j=1}^{k_n}\frac{p_{t_j^n}}{p_{t_{j-1}^n}} > \frac{Xa^{-1}[t_0,T]}{s_{t_0}})$$

$$\geq \int\int e^{x+y} I(x > \log \frac{Xa^{-1}[t_0,T]}{s_{t_0}} - y) d\Phi(\frac{x+\mu_{[t_0,T]}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}) L_T^*(dy).$$

Let $k = \log \frac{Xa^{-1}[t_0,T]}{s_{t_0}} - y$. For the integral with respect to x use (54) and (55) with $M = -\mu_{[t_0,T]},\ \Sigma^2 = \sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}$, to obtain $e^{-C} = e^{-\mu_{[t_0,T]}+\frac{\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{2}},\ M^* = -\mu_{[t_0,T]} + \sigma^2_{[t_0,T]},\ \Sigma^{*2} = \sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}$;

$$\int_k^\infty e^x d\Phi(\frac{x+\mu_{[t_0,T]}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}) = e^{-\mu_{[t_0,T]}+\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}} \int_k^\infty d\Phi(\frac{x+\mu_{[t_0,T]}-\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}})$$

$$= e^{-\mu_{[t_0,T]}+\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}} \Phi(\frac{-k-\mu_{[t_0,T]}+\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}}{\sigma_{[t_0,T]}}).$$

□

Proof of Corollary 4.1 Follows from Theorem 4.1 and (34) for $\tilde{Q}_n = P_{t_0,n},\ P_{T,n}$. In particular, a translation conditional on the value of the compound Poisson component in the distribution of $\log \frac{S_T}{S_{t_0}}$ allows to obtain *(iii)*.

□

Proof of Theorem 4.2 Follows the line of proof of Theorem 4.1 using Theorem 3.4 instead of Theorem 3.2. □

Proof of Corollary 4.2 Follows from Theorem 4.2 and (34) for $\tilde{Q}_n = P_{t_0,n},\ P_{T,n}$. □

Proofs of Theorems and Corollaries in section 4.4: Follow from those for section 4.3.

6.2 Conditions for $\mathcal{A}3$ and $\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]} = \sigma^2(T - t_0)$ to hold

Differentiability conditions are provided below for $\mathcal{A}3$ to hold. These conditions hold *often* in parametric statistical models. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, P)$ be a probability space and let $\rho(t), t \in [0, T]$, be a process indexed by t.

Definition 6.1 *The process ρ is differentiable at θ in P-quadratic mean if there is U_θ, its derivative at θ, such that*

$$\frac{1}{\delta^2}\int [\rho(\theta + \delta) - \rho(\theta) - \delta U_\theta]^2 dP \underset{\delta \to 0}{\longrightarrow} 0. \tag{56}$$

When $\theta = 0$ (resp. T) the limit in (56) is taken for δ positive (resp. negative).

For the prices-densities $\{p_t,\ t \in [0, T]\}$, let

$$\xi(t) = \sqrt{p_t},\ t \in [0, T]. \tag{57}$$

Then, for the square Hellinger distance $H^2(P_t, P_\theta)$ of P_t and P_θ (or of the corresponding densities) it holds

$$H^2(P_t, P_\theta) = .5\int (\sqrt{p_t} - \sqrt{p_\theta})^2 dP = .5\int (\frac{\xi(t)}{\xi(\theta)} - 1)^2 dP_\theta. \tag{58}$$

Conditions for $\xi(t)$ to be quadratic mean differentiable and examples of quadratic mean differentiable densities can be found in Le Cam (1970) and Roussas (1972, Chapter 2).

Proposition 6.2 *Assume that* $\xi(t)$ *is* P*-quadratic mean differentiable in* $[t_0, T]$ *with derivative* U_t*, and that* $\sup_{t\in[t_0,T]} E_P U_t^2 < \infty$*. Then,* $\mathcal{A}3$ *holds for the densities* $p_t,\ t \in [0, T]$.

Proof For any θ in $[t_0, T]$ and δ small,

$$2h^2(P_{\theta+\delta}, P_\theta) = \int (\frac{\xi(\theta+\delta)}{\xi(\theta)} - 1)^2 dP_\theta = \int (\frac{\xi(\theta+\delta)}{\xi(\theta)} - 1 - \frac{\delta U_\theta}{\xi(\theta)})^2 dP_\theta$$

$$+\delta^2 \int (\frac{U_\theta}{\xi(\theta)})^2 dP_\theta + \delta^2 o(1) = \delta^2[E_{P_\theta}(\frac{U_\theta}{\xi(\theta)})^2 + o(1)] = \delta^2[E_P U_\theta^2 + o(1)].$$

Thus, uniform boundedness of $E_P U_\theta^2$ implies $\mathcal{A}3(i)$ holds.

For transaction times with small mesh size in $[t_0, T]$,

$$2\sum_{j=1}^{k_n} h^2(P_{t_j^n}, P_{t_{j-1}^n}) = \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} (t_j^n - t_{j-1}^n)^2 E_P U_{t_{j-1}^n}^2 + o(1) \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} (t_j^n - t_{j-1}^n)^2$$

$$\le (T - t_0)^2[\sup_{t\in[t_0,T]} E_P U_t^2 + o(1)] < \infty.$$

$\square$

Remark 6.2 *The advantage in using derivatives in quadratic mean is that* $\frac{U_\theta}{\xi(\theta)}$ *and* $E_{P_\theta}(\frac{U_\theta}{\xi(\theta)})^2$ *may exist when the score function and Fisher's information at* θ *do not exist. Quadratic mean derivatives for various models, including the double exponential density for which the usual derivatives do not exist, can be found in Roussas (1972), p. 47-52.*

Proposition 6.3 *Under the assumptions of Proposition 6.2,* $\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]}$ *depends on the spacings of the transaction times and the quadratic mean derivatives of* *the process* ξ :

a)

$$\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]} = 4 \lim_{\tau\to 0} \lim_{n\to\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{k_n} (t_j^n - t_{j-1}^n)^2 E_P U^2_{t^n_{j-1}} I(|Y_{n,j}| \leq \tau), \ \textit{and}$$

b) If $t_j^n - t_{j-1}^n = \delta t_{j-1}^n,\ \delta > 0,$ *and* $E_P U^2_{t^n_{j-1}} I(|Y_{n,j}| \leq \tau) = \frac{c_\tau}{t^n_{j-1}},\ c_\tau > 0,$

$$\sigma^2_{[t_0,T]} = 4\delta(T - t_0) \lim_{\tau\to 0} c_\tau.$$

Proof From the proof of Proposition 6.2,

$$E_{P_{t^n_{j-1}}} Y^2_{n,j} I(|Y_{n,j}| \leq \tau) = (t_j^n - t_{j-1}^n)^2 [E_P U^2_{t^n_{j-1}} I(|Y_{n,j}| \leq \tau) + o(1)].$$

a) and *b)* follows from (28). □

References

[1] Bladt, M. and Rydberg, T. H. (1998) An actuarial approach to option pricing under the physical measure and without market assumptions. *Insurance: Mathematics and Economics* **22**, 65-73.

[2] Black, F. and Scholes, M. (1973) The Pricing of Options and Corporate Liabilities. *Journal of Political Economy*, 637-659.

[3] Blackwell, D. (1951) Comparison of experiments. *Proc. 2nd Berkeley Symp. Math. Stat. Probab.* 1, 93-102.

[4] Brealey, R., Myers, S. and Allen, F. (2008) *Principles of Corporate Finance.* McGraw-Hill, New York.

[5] Cox, J. C., Ross, S. A. and Rubinstein, M. (1979) Option pricing: A simplified approach. *Journal of Financial Economics* **7**, 229-263.

[6] Duffie, D. (2010) *Personal communication*

[7] Emhjellen, M. and Alaouze, C. (2002) Project valuation when there are two cashflow streams. *Energy Economics* **24**, 455-467.

[8] Fama, E. (1970) Efficient Capital Markets: A Review of Theory and Empirical Work. *Journal of Finance* 25, 383-417.

[9] Fama, E. (1965) The Behavior of stock market prices. *Journal of Business* 38, 34-105.

[10] Geman, H. (1989) The importance of the forward neutral probability in a stochastic approach of interest rates. Working paper, ESSEC.

[11] Jamshidian, F. (1989) An exact bond option formula. *Journal of Finance* **44**, 205-209.

[12] Kellison, S. G. (1970) *The Theory of Interest.* Irwin Inc., Illinois.

[13] Lamberton, D. and Lapeyre, B. (1996) *Introduction to Stochastic Calculus Applied to Finance.* Chapman and Hall, London.

[14] Le Cam, L. M. (1969) *Théorie Asymptotique de la Décision Statistique.* Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal.

[15] Le Cam, L. M. (1986) *Asymptotic Methods in Statistical Decision Theory.* Springer-Verlag, New York.

[16] Le Cam, L. M. (1970) On the assumptions used to prove asymptotic normality of maximum likelihood estimates. *Ann. Math. Stat.* **41**, 802-828.

[17] Le Cam, L. M. (1960) Locally asymptotically normal families of distributions. *Univ. California Publ. Statistics* **3**, 27-98.

[18] Le Cam, L. M. and Yang, G. L. (1990, 2000) *Asymptotics in Statistics: Some Basic Concepts.* Springer-Verlag, New York.

[19] Loève, M. (1977) *Probability Theory Vol. 1*, 4-th Edition, Springer-Verlag, New York.

[20] Mammen, E. (1986) The statistical information contained in additional observations. *Ann. Stat.* **14**, 665-678.

[21] Meerschaert, M. and Scheffler, H.-P. (2001) *Limit Distributions for Sums of Independent Random Vectors: Heavy Tails in Theory and Practice.* Wiley, New York

[22] Merton, R. C. (1976) Option pricing when underlying stock returns are discontinuous. *J. Financial Economics* **3**, 125-144.

[23] Merton, R. C. (1973) Theory of Rational Option Pricing. *Bell J. Econ. and Management Sci.* **4**, 160-183.

[24] Modigliani, F. and Miller, M. H. (1958) The Cost of Capital, Corporate Finance, and the Theory of Investment. *Amer. Econ. Rev.*, **3**, 261-297.

[25] Musiela, M. and Rutkowski, M. (1997) *Martingale Methods in Financial Modelling.* Springer, Berlin.

[26] Pollard, D. (2001) *Lectures on Le Cam theory.*

[27] Roussas, G. G. (1972) *Contiguous Probability Measures: Some Applications in Statistics.* Cambridge Univ. Press.

[28] Shiryaev, A. N. and Spokoiny, V. G. (2000) *Statistical experiments and decisions.* World Scientific Publishing Co. Inc., N.J.

[29] Sprenkle, C. (1961) Warrant prices as Indications of Expectations. *Yale Econ. Essays* **1**, 179-232.